



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ἐγενήθησαν 5 omit δὲ 6 εἶδεται for ἴδετε | add ὁ κυριος after ἔκειτο  
 8 ἐξελθουσαι for ἀπελθοῦσαι 9 add ὁ before Ἰησοῦς | ἀπηντησεν for  
 ὑπήντησεν 10 καὶ ἐκεῖ for κακεῖ 11 ἀπηγγειλον for ἀπήγγειλαν  
 12 συνβουλιον for συμβούλιόν 14 add αὐτον after πείσομεν | ποιησω-  
 μεν for ποιήσομεν 15 μεχρις for μέχρι | omit ἡμέρας 17 add αὐτω after  
 προσεκύνησαν 18 omit τῆς.

εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ  
 μαθθεον

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

### PROFESSOR HARNACK AND THE PARIS MANUSCRIPT OF JUSTIN

In the most recent of Professor Harnack's invaluable essays upon matters of early Christian literature,<sup>1</sup> he has included as an appendix a collation of the unique Paris manuscript of Justin's *Dialogue*, made by himself in September, 1887, with Otto's third edition (1877). Professor Harnack finds that Archambault's recent edition and apparatus (Paris, 1909) generally confirm the accuracy of his own collation, though his own is, he thinks, somewhat more exact than that of the French scholar. "A further collation is now," he concludes, "wholly superfluous (*vollkommen überflüssig*), as one can easily assure himself" (p. 93).

Being busied with the text of Justin at this time, I have been interested thus to assure myself, with the aid of a photograph of the Paris manuscript, which as Harnack truly says is the only one to be taken account of in treating the text of the *Dialogue*, inasmuch as the only other manuscript known to exist is a copy made from it. The comparison of my notes with those of Professor Harnack has served in a few instances, perhaps half a dozen in all, to complete my own, and for this I wish to make due acknowledgment. The main result of my partial and rapid examination, however, has been to show that Professor Harnack's list of the erroneous or incomplete notices of Otto's edition is less precise and complete than it should be, if, as Professor Harnack affirms, it is to make any further collation of the manuscript wholly superfluous.

The incompleteness and in some cases the mistakenness of Professor Harnack's readings are in fact such that unless they are promptly challenged real harm will be done to the textual study which he is

<sup>1</sup> *Ist die Rede des Paulus in Athen ein ursprünglicher Bestandteil der Apostelgeschichte? Judentum und Judenchristentum in Justins Dialog mit Trypho*, nebst einer Collation der Pariser Handschrift Nr. 450. ("Texte und Untersuchungen" 39, 1.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913.

seeking to further. That such a list of readings should go forth with the authority of his name as the closing word upon the investigation of the Paris manuscript promises positive disaster to the textual study of the *Dialogue*. The following notes are presented, not at all with the intention of completing Harnack's list; that would be a larger task; but simply as a protest against its acceptance as a definitive collation. My own readings of the Paris manuscript (which, following Otto, I shall designate A), I hope to exhibit in some fulness in an edition of the Greek Apologists, now in press. For the present, however, some particulars may be cited in which Professor Harnack's collation, or list of the incomplete or erroneous notices in Otto's third edition, proves inadequate. These are usually, though not always, matters of just such small detail as are the readings Professor Harnack has noted in his list, for it is the task of the collator to note all such readings, leaving the sifting of them to the textual critic. By the terms of his undertaking Professor Harnack indorses Otto's text as a transcript of A except where Otto's notes or Harnack's credit A with a variant.<sup>2</sup> In the following notes, departures of A from Otto's text or readings are mentioned only when Harnack has failed to detect or at least to note them.

I have not undertaken to include here those particulars in which Otto has specifically credited A with points or accents which it does not exhibit, nor a series of places where words have at first been left out of A by the scribe, and then supplied where they belong at the end of the line, apparently by another hand (Otto 114, 23; 128, 1; 154, 10). On 204, 9 Harnack records *πλάτους*; but as it stands in Otto's text and Otto's notes say nothing of any variant for it in A, Harnack's purpose is not clear. It will be seen that this partial list constitutes an appreciable supplement to Professor Harnack's report of 177 corrections and additions to Otto's record of the readings of A.

(1) Professor Harnack proposes to leave out of account the arbitrariness (*wechselnde Willkür*) of the manuscript in the names David and Moses (p. 93). The latter is indeed variously spelled in A, but not the former. David is mentioned nearly sixty times in the *Dialogue* and *Apology*, and in A invariably in the form δαδ' or δαδ'. Professor Harnack of course got his impression from the variety in the treatment of the word

<sup>2</sup> "Nachstehend sind alle irrtümlichen oder unvollständigen Angaben Ottos berichtigt auf Grund einer Collation des Ms., die ich im Sept. 1887 in Paris gemacht habe. . . . Eine nochmalige Collation ist nun vollkommen überflüssig, wie man sich leicht überzeugen kann. . . . In meiner Collation ist alles vermerkt was in Betracht kommen kann" (p. 93).

on the part of other editors and manuscripts: *Δαβίδ, Δανίδ, Δανείδ.*

(2) 4, 17 A margin reads *ευ*, not *εὐχ.*, as Otto quotes it as reading.

(3) 8, 21 A margin reads *ῆ*, unnoticed by Otto and Harnack.

(4) 24, 13 A reads *χείρωνι* for Otto's *χείρονι*.

(5) 26, 1 A text reads *ἀποθνήσκουσιν*, not *ἀποθνήσκουσι*, as Otto's note 13 states.

(6) 36, 20 A reads *ἐμβαλλόντος* for Otto's *ἐμβalόντος*.

(7) 42, 17 A reads *τῆς* for Otto's *γῆς*.

(8) 50, 1 A reads correctly *ῆρθη* for Otto's incorrect *ῆρθη*. If these false forms of *αἶρω* seem undeserving of notice, it should be observed that as recent an editor as Archambault (1909) takes them over from Otto unchallenged, afterward withdrawing a single one of them in his corrigenda.

(9) 50, 19 A reads *πασσάλους*, not *πεσσάλους* as Harnack says.

(10) 52, 7 A margin has no such note (*ἔως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ ἀπόκειται*) as Harnack says; indeed Gen. 49:10 is not quoted on this page. Harnack doubtless means chap. 52, where on line 7 of p. 176 his note would be appropriate and correct.

(11) 60, 10, 11 A twice reads correctly *ῆρται* for Otto's (incorrect) *ῆρται*, with which Otto, discussing l. 11, explicitly credits the manuscript by his "vulgo" (n. 16).

(12) 74, 13 A reads correctly *ἐξῆρα* for Otto's (incorrect) *ἐξῆρα*.

(13) 80, 8 A reads *εἰδολολατρῆτε* for Otto's *εἰδωλολατρῆτε*.

(14) 80, 24 A reads *ἀποκρινομένου* for Otto's *ἀποκριναμένου*.

(15) 88, 2 A reads *μνησθῆς* for Otto's *μνησθεῖς*. This is hardly a mere itacism, for as Otto observes, A reads *οὐ* before it, which he emends to *ὁ*.

(16) 126, 23 A reads *ἐπήρθησαν* for Otto's (incorrect) *ἐπήρθησαν* (Archambault *ἐπήρθησαν*).

(17) 144, 2 A reads *γένος* for Otto's *γένους*.

(18) 148, 17 A reads *ζήσετε* for Otto's *ζήσητε*.

(19) 154, 10 A margin reads *περιετέμετο* for Harnack's (meaningless) *περιετήνετο* (Archambault *περιετόμετο*). Here as in a few other instances below (*ἐμπέμπων, αὐτό, ἐν, τρίτον, λείον, κατελθόντο, ἀθελήσατε*) Harnack's paleography is at fault; he lacks a sense for cursive hands.

(20) 166, 30 A reads *εἰπείν* for Otto's *εἶπεν*.

(21) 180, 11 A reads with Otto *αὐτός*, not *αὐτό* as Harnack says.

(22) 196, 4 A reads *συμπέμπων* for Harnack's *ἐμπέμπων*. The absence of breathing should have warned Harnack against this mistake, though the letters are clear enough.

(23) 224, 9 should be 226, 9. A text has *εἰ μὴ τις* (corr.) *ἔστιν* for Harnack's *εἰ μὴ τί ἐστιν*. Harnack has overlooked the correction, perhaps under the influence of the margin, which as Otto correctly states (n. 1) reads *εἰ μὴ τι*, etc.

(24) 224, 14 A reads *ψυχῇ καὶ μιᾷ* for Harnack's *ψυχῇ ἐν μιᾷ*. This sign for *καί* occurs not infrequently in the manuscript, and is elsewhere rightly understood by Harnack. Harnack remarks this as a reading of considerable significance (p. 96).

(25) 230, 25 A has *ἴν'* for Otto's *ἴνα*.

(26) 238, 2 A reads *γεγένηται* with Otto's text, where Otto says it has *γεγένηται* (n. 9). This remark escaped Harnack's eye, being tucked obscurely away, after Otto's wont, in a note on another word.

(27) 238, 24 A reads *δὲ* for Otto's *δ'*.

(28) 240, 28 A reads *ἀπ'* for Otto's *ἐπ'* before *ἀνθρωπίους*. The word has been corrected, perhaps from *ἐπ'*. The present reading must have been meant for *ἀπανθρωπίους*, but *ἀπ* is followed by an apostrophe and a breathing perhaps not from the first hand.

(29) 246, 18 A reads *δν* for the *δν* of Otto's text, not *δ*, as Otto says (n. 22).

(30) 248, 3 A margin reads *μυστήριους* for Harnack's *μυστηρίους*.

(31) 248, 3 A first read *δνον* (generally believed to be the true reading) which has been changed to *οἶνον*, an iota being crowded in between the first *ο* and *ν*, and the accent changed. Thus A really supports the true reading, unobserved by Otto and Harnack. Here as occasionally elsewhere in A, it is important to reckon with the corrector.

(32) 252, 11 A reads *ἀνομοι · ἀνομοι* for Otto's *ἀνομοι*. Otto reports this repetition in the early editions, but says nothing about the manuscripts.

(33) 270, 20 Before *ἀνεκδιήγητον* A first read *οὐκ*, which has been imperfectly expunged. It is unnoticed by Otto and Harnack.

(34) 274, 2 A reads *φαρισσαίων* for Otto's *Φαρισαίων*. Harnack detected this at 174, 6 but not here.

(35) 280, 4 A reads *μάγοι* for Otto's *μάγοι*.

(36) 292, 23 A reads *γενήματα* for Otto's *γενήματα*. Otto credits the editions with *γενήματα*, but says nothing of the manuscripts.

(37) 302, 5 A reads *ἐμελλε* for Otto's *ἐμελλεν*.

(38) 310, 12, 13 A margin reads in a late hand *γρ(άφε) οὐ γεννόςω*, unnoticed by Otto and Harnack.

(39) 312, 5 A reads *διεληθέναι* for Otto's *διεληλυθέναι*.

(40) 312, 27 A reads *δρνι* (perhaps changed from *δρνι*) for Otto's *δρνι*.

(41) 320, 4 A reads *κατελθόντος*, with Otto; not, as Harnack reports, *κατελθόντο*. Here, as in No. 21 above, Harnack seems to have read the ligature *το* as *τ*, and *σ* as *ο*.

(42) 336, 24 A reads *γεναιαὶ* for Otto's *γενεαὶ*.

(43) 340, 9 A reads (correctly) *διχῇ* for Otto's *διχῆ*. Elsewhere Otto reads *διχῇ* correctly and with A (432, 1). In both readings Archambault follows Otto.

(44) 348, 28 A reads *ῆρται* for Otto's incorrect *ῆρται*.

(45) 386, 9 A reads *ἀνεληλυθέναι* for Otto's *ἀνεληλυθέναι*.

(46) 408, 20 A margin reads *ἠθελήσατε*; not as Harnack reports, *ἀθελήσατε*;

(47) 412, 7 A reads *ἀποκήρυξιν* for Otto's *προκήρυξιν* for which Otto claims the support of A.

(48) 422, 8 A reads *ῆρται* for Otto's (and Archambault's) doubly incorrect *ῆρται*.

(49) 470, 14, 15 A margin, like the text, has *τρίᾱκονταῖς* as one word; not two, as Harnack reports.

(50) 476, 21, 22 A reads *τὸ τρίτον σπέρμα*, corrected from *τὸ τρίτον σπέρμα* which Harnack reports as A's reading, and remarks as a variant of considerable significance (p. 96).

(51) 478, 26 A reads *λίνον* (the *-ν* is somewhat cramped, perhaps altered from *θ*); not *λίον* as Harnack reports.

One cannot repress a feeling of wonder that Professor Harnack, after holding a collation twenty-five years, should without apparent reason put it into print unverified, accompanying it with the extravagant claim that any recollection of the Paris manuscript would now be wholly superfluous. Harnack has indeed recorded probably most of the points in which Otto fails to show the reading of A, but something more than this is required of a definitive collation of a unique manuscript. What, moreover, is to be done where Harnack and Archambault disagree in their readings, that is, where one notes a variant and the other does not? If Harnack's collation is final, doubtless Archambault is to be disregarded; but this course is not always justified by the facts. The use of Archambault's text is indeed embarrassed by the disappointing inaccuracy of its printing, yet he sometimes detects a variant which has escaped Harnack, while Harnack sometimes records one which Archambault has not noticed. In thirteen of the above fifty-one particulars Archambault has already reported the true reading of A; eleven deal with mistakes of Harnack's in which he has not shared; in two he is himself in error. The remaining twenty-five, including Otto's mistaken spellings of *διχῇ*,

*ἡπται*, etc., all but one of which Archambault takes over without suspicion, are, with that one partial exception, unnoted in Archambault. That is, in about one-half the particulars noted he is on the right side, and in about half he is, with Harnack, on the wrong side.

The fact is the Paris manuscript has never yet been properly worked. Its frequent corrections, mainly it is true from the first hand, yet none the less to be reckoned with in a unique manuscript, have never been adequately treated. If the above list had been made to include every place in which the manuscript has been corrected by the first or another hand, unremarked by Otto and Harnack, the list would have been doubled. For a summary collation, or indeed for a manual edition, such detail may not be necessary. But when the definitive collation of the Paris manuscript is finally made it goes without saying that such matters will not be neglected. And that these are not the only points in which something may yet be learned from A, the above results of a partial examination of some select readings only, may at least suggest. One could wish that since Professor Harnack has put forth this collation as final, and since it will consequently be widely accepted and quoted as authoritative, he might be persuaded to re-examine the Paris manuscript, either in a photograph or in the original, and in the interest of textual accuracy emend his collation in the direction indicated above.

What then shall we say of Professor Harnack and the Paris manuscript of Justin? First, that if there exist even a slender list of disagreements between him and Archambault as to its readings, there is room for a fresh collation to settle these. Second, that this list is really larger than Professor Harnack realizes, being swelled by a number of variants supposed by Harnack to be in A, but not actually there. Third, Professor Harnack has failed to reckon with the possibility that there yet lurk in A variants which neither he nor Archambault has detected, a possibility upon which the above list has a bearing. Fourth, the mere corrections in A call for treatment in any collation that is to be final. It may be inferred that Professor Harnack is premature in closing the door upon the study of the Paris manuscript.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO